

## REMARKS

Claim 1 has been amended, and claims 8, 52-60 and 67-69 have been cancelled without prejudice. No new matter has been added. For instance, support for the amendment of claim 1 appears in original claim 8.

Claims 1-5, 8, 23-24, 35, 41 and 46-68 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph. The claim language “not an oxynorbornyl” is noted.

While Applicants fully disagree with the rejection, including for reasons set forth in Applicants’ prior response, the noted language has been deleted from the pending claims.

It is thus believed the rejection has been obviated.

Claims 1-2, 4-5, 23-24, 35 and 41 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 over Jung et al. (GB 2320718).

While Applicants disagree with the rejection, claim 1 has been amended to recite subject matter of former claim 8, which former claim was not rejected over Jung.

Withdrawal and reconsideration of the rejection are therefore requested.

Claims 1-2, 4-5, 24, 35, 41, 46, 48-50, 52-54 and 56-58 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) or, in the alternative under 35 U.S.C. 103 over Nishi et al. (U.S. Patent 6,566,038).

While Applicants also disagree with the rejection, claim 1 has been amended to recite subject matter of former claim 8, which former claim was not rejected over Nishi et al.

Barclay et al.  
U.S.S.N. 10/039,340  
Page 6

Withdrawal and reconsideration of the rejection are therefore requested.

Claim 69 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) over Barclay et. Al. (U.S. Patent 6841331).

Claim 69 has been cancelled without prejudice. It is thus submitted that the rejection is properly withdrawn.

It is believed the application is in condition for immediate allowance, which action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



---

Peter F. Corless (Reg. 33,860)  
EDWARDS ANGELL PALMER & DODGE, LLP  
P.O. Box 55874  
Boston, MA 02205  
(617) 439-4444